

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

JUN 04 2007

REMARKS**I. INTRODUCTION**

Claim 1-19 remain pending in the present application. In view of the following remarks, it is respectfully submitted that all of the pending claims are allowable.

II. THE 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) REJECTIONS SHOULD BE WITHDRAWN

Claims 10-17 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 4,335,214 to Levy et al ("Levy"). (11/02/06 Office Action page 3). Applicants wish to focus the discussion on whether Levy really teaches combining a feedback signal with a reflection signal, or demodulating such a signal into in-phase and quadrature signals, as recited in claim 10. What is interesting about the reasoning of the Examiner is that he never identifies with any specificity what he regards as the "reflection signal" in Levy. The Examiner identifies element 36 in Levy as meeting the step of demodulating a reflection signal into in-phase and quadrature signals, so the assumption apparently underlying the rejection is that the input into element 36 ought to be regarded as meeting the recited reflection signal. If that is the case, Applicants dispute this assumption. Only one signal can rightfully be regarded in Levy as a reflection signal, namely, the signal reflected back on transmission channel 43. Indeed, the only mention of a reflection signal in Levy is when it states that "[s]purious signals also arise from indirect leakage producing delayed echoes by reflection at impedance mismatches at various points *along the transmission channel.*" Column 1, lines 30-33 (emphasis added). Nowhere else in Levy is there any mention of reflection signals, yet the Examiner has somehow convinced himself that apart from transmission channel 43, the input line into element 36 also carries a reflection signal. Such a contention is supported by not a single shred of evidence. What is being supplied into element 36 is the output of ADC 35, which in turn receives the output of

subtracting circuit 34. How can these signals be viewed as carrying a reflection signal? The Examiner provides no answer. Unless the Examiner can provide some scientific reasoning adequately supporting his apparent assumption that the input signal into element 36 is a reflection signal, Applicants shall continue to insist that Levy does not demodulate a reflection signal into in-phase and quadrature signals.

Because claims 11-13 depend from, and therefore include all the limitations of, claim 10, these claims are also allowable.

Claim 14 recites “a demodulator to demodulate *a reflection signal* into an in-phase signal and a quadrature signal; a first filter to isolate an in-phase error signal from the in-phase signal; a second filter to isolate a quadrature error signal from the quadrature signal; a modulator to modulate the in-phase error signal and the quadrature error signal to create a feedback signal; and a combiner element to combine *the reflection signal* and the feedback signal to cancel at least a portion of radio frequency echo signals in *the reflection signal*.” For same reasons discussed with reference to claim 10, this is also allowable. It is respectfully submitted that the rejection of claim 14 should be withdrawn. Because claims 15-19 depend from, and therefore include all the limitations of, claim 14, these claims are also allowable.

III. THE 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) REJECTIONS SHOULD BE WITHDRAWN

Claims 1-9, and 19 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over by U.S. Patent No. 6,236,315 to Helms (“Helms”) Helms and Levy. As the Examiner stated, Helms “is silent on combining the reflection signal and a feedback signal to cancel at least a portion of radio frequency signals in the reflection.” (5/02/06 Office Action page 5). For the same reasons as discussed with reference to claims 10 and 14, it is respectfully submitted that the

neither the Helms patent nor the Levy patent, either alone or in combination, discloses or suggests demodulating a reflection signal into in-phase and quadrature signals. It is respectfully submitted that claim 1 and claim 8 and all claims depending therefrom are allowable and the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103 should be withdrawn.

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER


JUN 04 2007

CONCLUSION

It is therefore respectfully submitted that all of the presently pending claims are allowable. All issues raised by the Examiner having been addressed, an early and favorable action on the merits is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: June 4, 2007


By: _____
Oleg F. Kaplun (Reg. No. 45,559)

Fay Kaplun & Marcin, LLP
150 Broadway, Suite 702
New York, NY 10038
Tel: (212) 619-6000
Fax: (212) 619-0276